



Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan Review  
Public Scoping Meeting Comments

Oct. 4, 2008  
2 – 5 p.m.  
Governor Hotel, Olympia, WA

In all, 11 people attended the meeting (excluding sanctuary staff). Meeting attendees were divided into two discussion groups. Each group was facilitated by a sanctuary staff member. An additional staff member served as note-taker. Discussion groups sat around tables facing projected Microsoft Word blank document pages. Facilitators each asked their groups, “what should be Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary’s priorities for the next 5 to 10 years? Note-takers typed each group member’s comments so that the entire group could see them. Facilitators checked in with each participant to verify that his/her typed comments were accurate; the participants could then request changes to the wording. Here are the responses from each group.

Group #1

Facilitator: Mike Murray

Note-taker: John Barimo

- The sanctuary should do more research on baseline levels of water column plankton larval fish and forage fish species. This data is needed for oil spill response and natural resource damage assessment.
- The sanctuary should collaborate with the working parties in understanding the implications and effects of oil dispersants.
- The sanctuary should continue habitat mapping in the sanctuary. This habitat mapping data also needs to be ground-truthed.
- The sanctuary should have a cooperative agreement on the state/tribes ecosystem initiative. This initiative will look at rockfish stocks on a regional basis and look at rockfish stocks in relation to mapped habitat. There is a need to help improve the objectivity of scientific research produced by all resource managers.
- The sanctuary should consider that habitat mapping data should support other ecosystem objectives, and not just support sanctuary or rockfish needs.
- Data collected by the sanctuary needs to be available to concerned parties in an electronic format – especially Geographic Information System (GIS) data. Data also needs to be processed and analyzed in a timely manner. Cooperative agreements could help insure the analysis gets done.

- Data needs to be consistent with other entities that are collecting data along the coast (to include California, Oregon, Washington and Vancouver Island). Data collected and analyzed by sanctuary should be conducted with standardized methods.
- The sanctuary should conduct HAZWOPER (Hazardous Waste and Emergency Response) training for its staff and Coastal Observation and Seabird Survey Team (COASST) volunteers.
- The sanctuary should initiate a stakeholder process to develop a shared set of species and habitats to be evaluated. Determine the conditions of those species and habitats and jointly develop strategies to protect them. Leverage partnerships and identify gaps.
- A program to monitor the interspecies dynamics of increased abundance warm water species such as tuna and pelican. How are these changes affecting the ecosystem and what are these species eating (stomach contents analysis)?
- The sanctuary should recognize Neah Bay to Tatoosh Island as that best part of the sanctuary where recreational SCUBA diving does occur. And that the sanctuary should manage that part of the sanctuary to increase population levels of the longer-lived rockfish such as canaries, tigers and China rockfish. Work in cooperation with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and the tribes to promote watchable wildlife.
- Increased interpretive signage, staff presence and/or center for educational programs primarily during the summertime. Develop cooperative with local entities such as the Olympic National Park, the tribes and local business.
- The sanctuary should organize ecotourism events.
- Media outreach and film series to promote the sanctuary for regional communities. Even consider a nationwide audience.
- The sanctuary should continue looking at research into the impacts and feasibility of wind, wave and tidal energy production.
- The sanctuary should study who is the target audience for education programs, i.e., is it K-12 relative to the specific objective? Be strategic in determining the target audience considering funding is limited.
- The sanctuary should also seek to understand further who is coming to the coast and why (or alternative would be to determine who is not coming to the coast and why). Target to increase visits or education based on this information.
- The sanctuary should identify areas with derelict crab/fishing gear to allow for salvage of this derelict gear once the season is over.
- The sanctuary should research facts to support an intergovernmental policy agreement for quicker oil spill response times and increased capacity. The sanctuary should work with the tribes, and other state and federal agencies. Consider participating in the Regional Response Team. The sanctuary should be a strong voice for the needs for these response mechanisms. And that the threat comes from more than just the oil carriers but should include all commercial shipping carriers.
- To develop Memorandums of Understanding with oil spill response trustees to make available sanctuary resources (boats, volunteers, etc) to assist with natural resource damage assessment.

- The sanctuary should pursue an Intergovernmental agreement to declassify U.S. Navy maps and bathymetric data.
- The sanctuary should identify certain areas along the coast that are key for larval dispersal for a prioritized oil spill response to reduce impacts to critical habitats. Primarily identifying critical intertidal habitats.
- The sanctuary needs to increase attention from the sanctuary foundation to increase funding for projects in the sanctuary. We need galas and other fundraising events.
- Find ways to engage local high school and college students to be active with the sanctuary and staff conducting research.
- Develop education collaborations with other environmental education organizations, such as the Audubon Institute.
- Continue surveying and monitoring efforts for long-term data sets on marine mammals, seabirds, kelp, etc. Existing monitoring programs need to continue and be identified as high priority items and not be terminated.
- The sanctuary should outreach to other groups to coordinate opportunities for ship time on research vessels.

## Group #2

Facilitator: Lauren Bennett

Note-taker: Liam Antrim

- Marine Resource Committees on outer coast – need scientists and experts to be involved to advise county governments. The sanctuary staff can provide support and information, and encourage community involvement.
- Information available to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) could be augmented. Sanctuary could help with data-poor stock assessments to fill in data gaps.
- How much do we know about resources (species and habitats); what are important resources to local communities? The sanctuary should fill in data gaps and find ways to work collaboratively to manage, protect, and sustain uses on shared priorities.
- Biodiversity conservation should be main focus of sanctuary and management plan. Primary purpose of sanctuary is to protect resources in area.
- A key role of the sanctuary is long term monitoring of living resources. Sites where long-term data is collected are needed. The sanctuary can serve this role by conducting and encouraging research and monitoring, and maintaining data and history.
- Coordination among agencies is import role for sanctuary with regards to long-term monitoring and eradication of invasive species.
- A priority should be to maintain existing resources (living and non-living) – with focus on biodiversity, water quality, habitats. Research, education, partnerships, and preparing for change are ways to approach this.
- The sanctuary should pursue a policy of ecosystem-based management, which should focus on interaction of all elements of ecosystems, including humans as element of the system.

- Threats to resources should be assessed, including current and potential future ones.
- Corals and living organisms that form seafloor habitats should be protected as best we can. These habitats regenerate very slowly after damage.
- The sanctuary should play a key role in working with the Navy (i.e. test range within sanctuary) to coordinate with multiple agencies to identify and mitigate threats of Navy activities. Navy activities can pose threats to marine organisms, e.g., marine mammals. Navy has proposed increasing activities and areas of operations in the sanctuary.
- Vessel traffic levels decreasing, especially sport and commercial fishing traffic. Commercial shipping stable levels, but cruise ship traffic increasing. Vessel discharges within or adjacent to sanctuary waters may be increasing. To protect water quality and shellfish health, sanctuary should work towards developing agreement(s) to address the threats posed by these discharges.
- The sanctuary should facilitate communications with Canada to coordinate management of resources in international border area. Fishing, vessel traffic, etc. in Canadian waters can influence condition of sanctuary resources.
- Oil spill prevention and response are important priorities for sanctuary.
- Area to be Avoided (ATBA) has provided buffer zone where response time is increased – sanctuary should continue to maintain its ATBA program.
- Sanctuary should support year-round funding of Neah Bay rescue tug.
- Non-laden tugs with barges could pose threat to sanctuary. ATBA program should address these vessels also.
- Important for the sanctuary to educate, engage, and involve members of coastal communities, especially on projects that focus on issues that effect local communities. Stakeholder involvement is important because their input is important to success of sanctuary's efforts. Transparency on the part of the sanctuary is important.
- Sanctuary should work with local communities to use local knowledge of resources.
- The sanctuary should implement an immediate ban on actions that have damaged resources of sanctuary. Protection of resources should be the primary role of sanctuary management, and action should occur immediately. Naval testing and damage to corals are examples where this is needed.
- The sanctuary should be proactively involved with assessment, monitoring and mitigation of impacts of alternative energy development in the sanctuary, including interfacing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and participating in regulatory processes associated with alternative energy development.
- The sanctuary should be more specific in defining what sanctuary resources are and their status, and establishing measurable goals and metrics relative to sanctuary resources in the new management plan. Benchmarks for measurement of change are important for effective management.
- Sanctuary should conduct retrospective analysis of its accomplishments since designation.

- Sanctuary should take lead in establishing coastal marine research station along northern coast (modeled after Mote, Bamfield, Moss Landing labs). These stations focus research on local resources, and provide economic benefits and educational opportunities to communities.
- Sanctuary should continue its primary role in annual coastal cleanup – benefits include community outreach and removal of marine debris.
- Relationship between coastal tribes and sanctuary has developed through the Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC), but areas for potential conflict exist. The sanctuary's priority for protection of resources should outweigh treaty rights of Native American tribes.
- Sanctuary should take lead in educating public especially with marine mammals and improvements to whale watching operations. Whale watching is main way for public to interact with marine mammals.
- Sanctuary should continue its objective of multiple uses within its boundaries. The Office of Marine Sanctuaries should maintain this focus. Diversity of use is important to local communities. It maintains engagement of a greater portion of society with sanctuary program, and has economic benefits (e.g., contributes a significant portion of local economies).
- Sanctuary should resolve conflicts based on best available science.
- Sanctuary should look across spectrum of agencies and organizations to identify resource data gaps.
- A priority should be continuation of seafloor mapping and habitat classification programs. Mapping efforts should be completed.
- Monitoring program for near shore buoys should be expanded to record plankton and other water quality parameters at depth. Surface monitoring currently conducted does not fully address data needs, especially to identify issues such as ocean acidification.